

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 29, 2013

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Avondale: Kristen Sexton for David
Fitzhugh
Glendale: Debbie Albert, Acting Chair
ADOT: John Nelson for Floyd
Roehrich
Buckeye: Jose Heredia for Scott Lowe
Cave Creek: Ian Cordwell
Chandler: Dan Cook
El Mirage: Jorge Gastelum for Sue
McDermott
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel
* Gila Bend: Eric Fitzer
* Gila River: Steven Johnson
Gilbert: Dawn Irvine for Leah Hubbard
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel

Litchfield Park: Woody Scoutten
* Maricopa (City): Paul Jepson
Maricopa County: Lynne Hilliard for John
Hauskins
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Scott Butler
* Paradise Valley: Jim Shano
Peoria: Andrew Granger
Phoenix: Ray Dovalina for Rick Naimark
* Queen Creek: Troy White
Scottsdale: Todd Taylor for Paul Basha
Surprise: Dick McKinley for Terry Lowe
Tempe: Shelly Seyler
Valley Metro: Wulf Grote for John Farry
Wickenburg: Vince Lorefice
Youngtown: Grant Anderson for Jeanne
Blackman

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Street Committee: Charles Andrews,
Avondale
*ITS Committee: Catherine Hollow, City of
Tempe
FHWA: Ed Stillings

Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee: Denise
Lacey, Maricopa County
*Transportation Safety Committee: Renate
Ehm, City of Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

John Bullen, MAG
Alice Chen, MAG
Valerie Day, MAG
Monique De Los Rios-Urban, MAG
Maureen DeCindis, MAG
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Teri Kennedy, MAG
Alex Oreschak, MAG
Steve Tate, MAG

Eileen Yazzie, MAG
Giao Pham, City of Apache Junction
Win Holden, ADOT
Christine McMurdy, City of Goodyear
Stephen Chang, City of Surprise
Sunel Garb, City of Surprise
Kent Dibble, Dibble Engineering
Dan Maum, Wilson & Company

1. Call to Order

Acting Chairwoman Debbie Albert from the City of Glendale called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Acting Chairwoman Albert noted that there was an addendum at the table for an updated attachment for Agenda Item #8.

2. Call to the Audience

3. Approval of Draft August 1, 2013 Minutes

Mr. Jeff Martin from the City of Mesa motioned to approve the minutes. Mr. Dan Cook from the City of Chandler seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Mr. Roger Herzog, Senior Project Manager at MAG, to provide the Transportation Director's Report.

Mr. Herzog informed the committee that the half cent sales tax revenues for July were \$29.8 million, 3.5% over revenues in July 2012, indicating a continuation of the pattern of improving revenues, and nearly identical to estimates for July. The Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) for July was \$104.8 million statewide, 7.4% above July 2012 figures and above the estimate of \$101.7 million. Mr. Martin asked Mr. Herzog to clarify the percentage increase for the HURF, which was 7.4% over July 2012.

5. Consent Agenda

Addressing the next item of business, Acting Chairwoman Albert directed the Committee's attention to the consent agenda item 5A - Draft FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - Interim Listing of Projects. She asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Seeing none, Acting Chairwoman Albert requested a motion. Mr. Cook motioned to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Martin seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

5A. Draft FY 2014-2018 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - Interim Listing of Projects

The MAG Transportation Review Committee, by consent, acknowledged receipt of the Draft FY 2014-208 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - Interim Listing of Projects for an air quality conformity analysis, to review and comment on as appropriate.

6. Request for 2nd Deferral of the Construction Phase of Surprise Dove Valley Paving Project

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Ms. Teri Kennedy from MAG to introduce Dick McKinley, Public Works Director from the City of Surprise, to present on the City of Surprise's request for a second deferral on the construction phase of the Surprise Dove Valley paving project. Ms. Kennedy noted that in Section 600 of the MAG Policies and Procedures, there are certain criteria

that must be met for a deferral: that the agency must show continual progress on the project, and that the agency must show the delays due to the scheduling of the project are outside the agency's controls. Ms. Kennedy noted that the item was on the agenda for action, and that the MAG Streets Committee recommended approval on August 13, 2013.

Mr. McKinley provided an overview of the project, a dust control project to pave 2 miles of Dove Valley Road to 28' of width addressing shoulders and crossings. The City of Surprise applied for and received CMAQ funding addressing PM-10 particulate matter.

Mr. McKinley provided an overview of the project's timeline. Surprise has received both environmental and utility clearances, and has commenced right of way acquisition. However, Surprise still needs 2 parcels, one from State Lands and one from a private entity. The private parcel has a trust issue that has caused problems with the timeline. Plans for the project are complete, and both material clearance and utilities clearances are completed. Right-of-way appraisals have been ordered. The process for acquiring the property from State Lands takes approximately 12-18 months, and no issues are anticipated with State Lands.

Mr. McKinley explained that the City of Surprise is moving forward with condemnation on the private parcel. Mr. McKinley noted that there was an option for avoiding condemnation by shifting the location of the road, but that option would have cost more money and was not the right solution for the problem. Mr. McKinley explained that the City of Surprise could not meet the existing obligation schedule due to the previously mentioned land acquisition issues, and that the City of Surprise needs one more deferral to complete the land acquisition and finish the project.

Mr. Cook asked when project funding was first awarded for this project. Mr. McKinley responded that the CMAQ grant was awarded in 2008-2009, for construction in FY 2012, and has been in development since then. Mr. Cook also asked what the schedule was for clearing the right of way for the state land and completing the obligation. Mr. McKinley explained that the City of Surprise expected to have most of the right of way done by the end of calendar year 2013 or beginning of calendar year 2014, with obligation in April 2014. Acting Chairwoman Albert asked for a motion. Mr. Cook moved to recommend approval. Mr. Dovalina seconded the motion, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

7. FY 2014-2017 MAG Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Projects

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Mr. Sarath Joshua from MAG to present on the MAG Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Projects.

Mr. Joshua started by discussing background of the HSIP, and where the money comes from. Mr. Joshua explained ADOT started sub-allocating HSIP funds in 2010 to MPOs and COG's. At that time, MAG was receiving about \$1.3 million, mainly targeting low-cost safety improvements. MAG has programmed about 47 safety improvement projects throughout the region. Recently, expansion of the MAG planning area boundaries increased MAG's HSIP allocation from \$1.3 million to \$1.9 million. ADOT has asked MAG to issue a Call for Projects so that projects could be obligated in a timely manner. MAG issued a Call for Projects, received projects, and proposed recommendations. The results of this process were presented to the TRC committee.

Mr. Joshua explained that state gets \$32 million each year for HSIP, and of that total, local MPOs and COGs get about \$8 million each year. From that \$8 million, MAG receives about \$1.9 million per year. To expedite the obligation of projects, MAG has proposed programming 4 fiscal years of projects. A Call for Projects was issued on July 1, 2013. MAG received 6 applications from 4 member agencies. All 6 projects were proposed with multiple phases to help obligate projects. The projects were evaluated at the MAG Transportation Safety Committee on August 20, 2013, and the committee recommended all 6 projects.

Mr. Joshua detailed the 4 types of projects that were proposed. One type was intersection improvements, such as 59th and Olive, which is the 2nd highest crash risk intersection in the region (the intersection that is the highest crash risk, Dunlap and 35th Avenue is already programmed for improvements). Another type is sign inventory and management systems, which are already being implemented by a number of agencies, and will soon be a requirement under MUTCD. A third type of project is accessible pedestrian signals for the visually impaired, and the final project type was sign upgrades.

On August 20, 2013, the Transportation Safety Committee recommended approval of all 6 projects. In FY 2014, there are 6 project phases proposed for a total of \$1,093,115, leaving a balance of \$806,885. In FY 2015, there are 2 project phases proposed for a total of \$342,000, leaving a balance of \$1,558,000. In FY 2016, there are 4 project phases proposed for a total of \$599,304, leaving a balance of \$1,300,696. In FY 2017, there are 2 project phases proposed for a total of \$1,527,370, leaving a balance of \$372,630. Mr. Joshua noted that few projects were received due in part to the complex project eligibility criteria defined by ADOT and FHWA.

Mr Joshua explained that there are still unobligated HSIP funds in each year from FY 2014-2017. A portion of the unobligated balance will be obligated to projects that were already approved by Central Arizona Governments (CAG) prior to expansion of MAG boundaries, for projects within the new expanded MAG boundary. These projects (all from Apache Junction) total \$232,805 in FY 2014, \$301,068 in FY 2015, and \$299,903 in FY 2016. Those projects will reduce the remaining unobligated funds to \$574,080 in FY 2014, \$1,256,932 in FY 2015, \$1,000,793 in FY 2016, and \$372,630 in FY 2017.

Mr. Joshua told the committee that MAG is currently developing a new Strategic Transportation Safety Plan (STSP), with Margaret Boone from MAG as the project manager. Mr. Joshua stated that MAG would be holding a workshop on September 24th for the STSP, and would like all agencies to try and attend. Mr. Joshua explained that the MAG Transportation Safety Committee would discuss options for programming the balance of unobligated HSIP funds, focusing on two options: a second call for projects, and/or retaining the unobligated funds in order to address regional road safety initiatives that will be identified in the STSP.

Acting Chairwoman Albert asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Acting Chairwoman Albert asked where the Apache Junction projects that Mr. Joshua described came from. Mr. Joshua explained that CAG had previously programmed those projects, and because Apache Junction is now included in the MAG planning area, MAG would be including those projects in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Cook asked if that meant that Apache Junction's projects were double programmed, with CAG and MAG both programming the projects. Mr. Joshua explained that the projects were only being programmed

by MAG now, and not by CAG. Ms. Kennedy from MAG further explained that FY2014 funding includes the expanded boundaries for MAG, so the Apache Junction projects were being moved from the CAG TIP to the MAG TIP, so they will only be programmed once. Mr. Joshua additionally noted that the expanded MAG boundaries will be used in future Calls for Projects.

Acting Chairwoman Albert requested a motion. Mr. Martin motioned to approve. Mr. Dovalina seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

8. Transportation Alternatives Program: DRAFT Goals, Objectives, and Competitive Process

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie from MAG to present on the Transportation Alternatives Program DRAFT Goals, Objectives, and Competitive Process.

Ms. Yazzie explained that MAP-21, the current federal transportation law, consolidated three programs that were previously available under SAFETEA-LU into one new program, Transportation Alternatives (TA): Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and Recreational Trails. Previously, these three programs were managed by the state. The MPOs provided recommendations of projects from their regions, but a collection of representatives from the state and all of the COGs and MPOs determined the best programs state-wide. MAP-21 consolidated the programs under one umbrella and distributed half of the available funding for TA directly to MPOs with populations over 200,000. For Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014, MAG made a determination to fulfill existing commitments to previously awarded TE and SRTS projects. Previously, ADOT had capped Transportation Enhancements projects at \$500,000. MAG therefore increased the federal commitment to the maximum federal share of 94.3%. Moving ahead to FY 2015-2017, MAG had \$4.4 million per year to program.

Ms Yazzie explained that MAG initiated a survey in June 2013 of member agencies through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, Transportation Safety Committee, Street Committee, Transit Committee, and Transportation Review Committee to determine TA priorities. There were 60 responses out of 105 people the survey had been sent to. Ms. Yazzie noted that she was presenting only a few of the survey results, to provide a high-level overview, and that the full survey results would be made available to the Committee through the MAG Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program website. Ms. Yazzie noted that a strong majority of respondents wanted funding to apply to projects previously eligible under the TE and SRTS programs. The survey indicated that connectivity (to transit, to destinations, to K-8 schools) on both the on-street and off-street networks was a large priority for the region, as was improving identified or perceived problems or safety issues on both the on-street and off-street networks.

The survey results indicated that some of the most critical issues faced while walking included missing or poorly maintained sidewalks, as well as unsafe street crossings. The most critical issues faced while biking included a lack of on-street bike lanes, as well as bike facilities ending or dead ending without connections. The final result highlighted asked respondents to indicate what they would prioritize if they had \$100 to spend on different types of projects. With this question, survey respondents indicated they would primarily focus their funds on on-street bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (\$33.27), with the remaining amounts primarily distributed to SRTS infrastructure (\$23.81), off-street bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (\$22.75), and connecting bicyclists and pedestrians to transit (\$20.94). The respondents indicated the remaining funds (\$6.56) should be spent on SRTS non-infrastructure projects. As part of the

survey, MAG wanted to ascertain whether there was a regional desire for non-infrastructure SRTS projects to be included in the funding, and the survey indicated that there was support for continuing funding for non-infrastructure SRTS projects in the MAG TA program.

Ms. Yazzie then presented on the draft goals and objectives for the TA program. Ms. Yazzie noted that the TA project application and evaluation process will be based on the goals and objectives. Projects that do not address the MAG goals and objectives, but are federally eligible, such as a project to landscape a median, could be submitted by member agencies, but those projects will not score well during the evaluation process and are therefore unlikely to be funded. Additionally, under MAP-21, performance measures, goals, and objectives will be more highly focused. The goals and objectives drafted by MAG are relating closely with draft performance measures being developed nationally, such as accessibility, connectivity, safety, safe routes to school, and equity.

Ms. Yazzie indicated that MAG is proposing to set aside \$400,000 per year for non-infrastructure SRTS projects. Originally, MAG had proposed setting aside \$250,000, but due to anticipated demand from member agencies, that proposed value was increased. However, if the application submissions total less than the maximum amount of \$400,000, any remaining funding will be flexed to infrastructure projects.

Ms. Yazzie provided an overview of the proposed evaluation team for the TA program. For infrastructure projects, the evaluation team would consist of two members each from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, Street Committee, and Transportation Safety Committee, as well as one member from the Transit Committee and one representative each from ADOT and FHWA, for a total of 9 evaluators. For non-infrastructure SRTS projects, MAG is proposing that the Transportation Safety Committee would continue to evaluate the projects, as that committee has been evaluating non-infrastructure SRTS projects for the past 5 years under SAFETEA-LU.

In order to move the TA program forward, the next steps are to present the draft goals, objectives, and competitive process to the Management Committee, Transportation Policy Committee, and Regional Council for final approval in September. As that moves forward, MAG staff will finalize development of the application and continue to develop evaluation criteria related to the application. The Call for Projects for infrastructure projects would open no later than September 26. The process for non-infrastructure applications may come later in the year, as infrastructure projects generally take 2 years to obligate from the time of the award, and non-infrastructure projects require less time to get through the federal process. The deadline for submission of infrastructure project applications would be in late October, for recommended approval in December-January.

Acting Chairwoman Albert asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Cook asked whether non-infrastructure project funding will be able to be used for larger city/town bike events such as giveaways of bike helmets, yearly bike events, or bike education literature. Ms. Yazzie responded that under MAP-21, the eligibility does not include Transportation Enhancements education projects, such as general bike safety education. Therefore, only SRTS education is eligible for funding. The \$400,000 per year is limited to SRTS non-infrastructure projects. Mr. Wulf Grote from Valley Metro Rail asked why the Transit Committee would only have one representative for the TA evaluation team, while the other committees would have two each. Ms. Yazzie responded that there needed to be a tie-breaker

vote for the evaluation team, and additionally, while transit is important when it comes to TA infrastructure projects, the other 3 committees (Bicycle and Pedestrian, Street, and Transportation Safety) have a much deeper history and experience with delivering these types of projects. However, the transit perspective is important in the selection of TA infrastructure projects, particularly in evaluating access to transit and connectivity, so it is important to have Transit Committee representation on the evaluation panel. Mr. Grant Anderson from Youngtown requested that, when the committee is presented with the list of recommended projects for approval, the committee also be presented with the list of projects that are not recommended for approval, so that the committee can see whether the recommendations from the evaluation team follow the guidelines that were put in place.

Hearing no other questions, Acting Chairwoman Albert requested a motion. Mr. Martin motioned to approve. Mr. Cook seconded, and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

9. Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study - Recommendation, Findings, and Tools

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Ms. Yazzie from MAG to present on the Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study (ST-LUIS) - Recommendation, Findings, and Tools.

Ms. Yazzie noted that the ST-LUIS started as an off-shoot of the Regional Transit Framework Study in 2010, which finished with questions of land use and how a system of 44 high-capacity transit (HCT) lines could be productive, if it could be productive, based on employment throughout the valley, as well as the cost of building out the system. Ms. Yazzie defined HCT as either light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, or streetcar.

Ms. Yazzie showed a graphic of where the 44 HCT corridors might be built, and the land use distribution within ½ mile of the corridors. Ms. Yazzie noted that 73% of transit riders walked or rode a bike to reach transit. The ST-LUIS sought to identify whether there were existing land uses compatible with high-capacity transit that support safe and accessible ways for people to walk or bike to transit. MAG partnered with the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to have two public business forums. As a result, MAG was able to integrate market truths and the reality of conditions in the MAG region into the study results. As an example, Ms. Yazzie noted that the study does not generally recommend 20-story buildings, though there are parts of the region that have buildings of that size and could support that in the urban centers. Rather, the study generally recommends 5-7 stories in high-density areas.

Part of the study included market research, particularly on millennials and baby boomers, who are looking for different lifestyles out of a car, focused more on transit, walking and biking. Knowledge-based employment centers and high gas prices are also factors that were studied. Ms. Yazzie noted that performance measures and data are becoming more important as related to federal funding. A more competitive process over fewer federal funds means the MAG region will need to compete with and be evaluated against projects around the nation, and will need to have conditions that warrant improved transit. One of the factors that helped fuel the study was the existing 20-mile light rail line, which has been highly successful.

MAG held 8 to 9 stakeholder meetings, undertook an employment market analysis memorandum, and completed scenario modeling as part of the study. Key findings include that

demand for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is supported by demographics in the MAG region. In a future with about 8 million people in the region, about 1 million will demand a TOD-type lifestyle. Another finding was that compact walkable development and TOD are both achievable in different parts of the region. The study has helped to push the dialogue that the MAG region is very diverse; high-capacity transit is not going to work everywhere, but compact walkable developments can work in most locations to provide other sustainable transportation options. The study also found that a mix of light rail transit, upgraded bus service, and corridor modifications increases transit use and productivity. This speaks to the need for a very integrated system of diverse transit types that work together. Increased service means there is less cost to the taxpayers.

A large portion of the study was dedicated to scenario modeling. Ms. Yazzie explained that scenario modeling does not result in recommending specific corridors for approval. It does look at different options, especially as they relate to the land use issue. Scenario modeling did not include any upgrading of the bus system at all. This leaves room, when the region starts making decisions, to run a number of different scenarios.

MAG ran three different scenarios during the study. The first was called transit supply, which included all 44 high-capacity corridors that came out of the Regional Transit Framework Study. The second scenario pared the transit supply scenario down, while the third scenario, called enhanced transit, involved only a moderate expansion of the HCT network from the current existing and planned network. Ms. Yazzie noted that even the smallest scenario, the enhanced transit network, still included 160 miles of HCT, which would double or triple the network as defined by Proposition 400.

The scenario planning exercise did involve changing the land use at the station areas, converting them to HCT-oriented, transit-served, and compact walkable land use place types. The results of the scenario modeling led to a recommendation of enhanced transit, noting that a smaller, compact, selective HCT network (160 miles) worked better from a transit productivity, cost, and ridership standpoint. The overall recommendation of the study is to provide a high quality, productive transit system supported by compact walkable and transit-oriented place types. The study looked at how the region can start shifting from a suburban development pattern toward compact walkable, transit-served, and HCT oriented development, based on 7 characteristics: density, land use, transit, employment, walk access to transit, locations, and market opportunity.

The study created an interactive PDF tool, which is both an informative tool and an interactive tool that will allow agencies to examine what types of transit may serve them best based on existing land use patterns, as well as using the tool to explore how shifting land use types can be accomplished, and what that will mean for future transit development. The tool will even provide a warning for users who would consider moving from a suburban development pattern to a HCT-oriented development pattern. Additionally, the study produced a prototype development catalog to provide examples from around the valley on different place types, along with general guidelines related to the place type. The study also led to a tool to evaluate HCT corridors, with metrics relating to land use, transit supportive densities, and transit demand. This tool can be adapted in the future based on regional needs and FTA direction and evaluation; the metrics can be moved around and made more flexible to meet those needs. These tools really push the region to look at data when making future decisions on transit corridors and land uses.

Mr. Martin requested that the recommended action be modified to make clear that MAG is using FTA evaluation criteria in the process. Mr. Cook thanked Ms. Yazzie for doing a great job with this study, and noted that any time a tool that MAG agencies can use to develop and improve transit can be created, it is a great opportunity. Mr. Cook said that this study sets a good definition of what the region considers to be sufficient, a standard or goal, and a document that member agency staff can point their Councils to, in relation to what is needed if a city or town is going to be able to have high capacity transit. Ms. Yazzie noted that this is really a document that belongs to the MAG agencies, and at the end of the day, it's a taxpayer issue. How can the system work best for the taxpayers? Mr. Cook pointed out that there is a limit to what can be funded, and this study will help the best projects rise to the top. If this study can help projects meet FTA criteria from the beginning, it will be great.

Mr. Grote commented that a number of great things came out of this study. Tools that help people understand the relation of land use to transit are excellent, and commented that this study is really just a beginning in understanding how land use decisions relate to the transit. Mr. Grote also noted that land use is a major factor in transit, but not the only factor. Other things such as increased bus service and higher frequencies of service need to be kept in mind as well, but land use is perhaps the most important component. Mr. Martin noted that the Transit Committee debated this study for about a year, and he appreciated Ms. Yazzie and Mr. Eric Anderson's efforts to put this all together. Mr. Martin noted that some of the extensions that are currently being worked on model very well in terms of ridership and other factors. Mesa does not have the kind of place type being recommended in ST-LUIS, as Main Street in Mesa used to be US-60, and was built as a highway. But Mesa has a good population for transit and underlying bus service, plus a large catchment area to the east. Mr. Martin explained that, even if an agency does not meet some of the place-type requirements, there are other ways that FTA criteria can be met.

With the modification, Mr. Martin recommended approval of the motion to accept the Sustainable Transportation Land Use Integration Study recommendation, key findings, and tools to be considered in future planning efforts and be consistent with the Federal Transit Administration process, and FTA evaluation criteria. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

10. Update on Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Mr. Bob Hazlett. to present on the update to the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Hazlett noted that he had a lengthy presentation to give, and it could be deferred to the next meeting. The committee chose to hear the presentation rather than defer it to the next meeting.

Mr. Hazlett discussed existing MAG framework studies: the I-10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study, the I-8/I-10 Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study, the Regional Transit Framework Study, the Hassayampa Framework Study for the Wickenburg Area, the Freight Transportation Framework Study, the Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study, and the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Hazlett noted that the Hassayampa and Hidden Valley studies led to the designation of the new I-11 corridor, and that the Regional Transit Framework Study led to the identification of 44 HCT corridors. Mr. Hazlett noted that all of these studies will help inform the next generation of the Regional Transportation Plan as the region looks beyond Proposition 400.

Mr. Hazlett described the project timeline. The project began in 2011, with major outreach to over 500 different interests on what the future should look like inside Loop 101. In 2012, there were a number of charrettes that led to ideas and concepts that people wanted to see happen in the Central Phoenix area. Today, MAG is in the process of finalizing the study, which will lead to steps for the next planning process of the Regional Transportation Plan, as well as the COMPASS studies on Grand Avenue and 99th Avenue, and the I-10/I-17 Corridor Master Plan “spine” study.

Mr. Hazlett described the study area, inside the Loop 101. The population of the study area is 2.3 million and employment is 1.3 million (about 75% of the region in both instances). In the future, however, the Central Phoenix area will contain less than 50% of the employment and population due to population increases to both the east and west.

There were 14 recurring themes that came out of the charrettes, including complete streets, “last mile strategies”, and road diets. There were also calls for traditional means to meet travel demands. Mr. Hazlett said that this implied a need to address choke points in the network, but not necessarily to widen the existing corridors. The study spoke to a need to find better ways for people to make connections. There were over 200 total project ideas to come out of the charrettes, primarily focused around transit, bicycles and pedestrians, the arterial intersections and links, and freeway interchanges and links. Because of the volume and costs of all the ideas, it is unlikely that all of them could be implemented.

The project consultant sifted through all of the proposed ideas and created a database for mapping and a qualitative analysis using the EPA-DOT-HUD sustainability criteria. From this database, the consultant identified 14 final work products to help inform the next generation of the Regional Transportation Plan: Improvement Strategies, the “Spine Corridor”, the Freeway System Plan, the SR-30 Corridor Extension, Park-and-rides, DHOVs, ATM Deployment, Roadway Maintenance, DDIs, Indirect Left Turn Arterial Concepts, Arterial Intersections, Transit Strategies, Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategies, and an Executive Summary Poster. Mr. Hazlett focused on five of these products: the “Spine Corridor”, the Freeway System Plan, the SR-30 Corridor Extension, Park-and-Rides, and DHOV’s.

Mr. Hazlett noted that MAG, FHWA, and ADOT met to discuss the corridor studies being done on the I-10 and I-17 corridors. Earlier environmental studies had indicated the potential to widen I-10 to 24 lanes, and I-17 to 18 lanes, and led to project budget territories that were beyond what the region could afford. About a month after ADOT suspended the Environmental Impact Studies for both of those corridors, MAG was asked to conduct a “Spine Corridor” workshop to discuss the future of these two corridors. As a result, the path forward became more defined: with the \$1.5 billion programmed for these corridors through the Regional Transportation Plan, a four-step process of spot improvements, a corridor master plan (led by MAG over a 12-18 month period), environmental studies, and design, construction, and operation. Spot improvements in the near term would address immediate needs and bottlenecks within existing ADOT rights-of-way. At the same time, the Request for Proposals for the Corridor Master Plan has been released, with proposals due to MAG by October 3, 2013. ADOT would lead the Environmental Studies and handle design, construction, and operation in the future.

Mr. Hazlett noted that, as part of the Central Phoenix study, the consultant had already begun to look at some of the issues related to both interstate freeways. One of the interchanges examined

was the “split interchange” of I-10 and I-17 by Sky Harbor Airport. This interchange was discovered to be in Sky Harbor’s airspace, and if any modifications were made to this interchange, the entire interchange would have to be moved entirely out of the airspace. The consultant examined how modifications could be made to move forward with improving the interchange.

Another discussion during the study, relating to the Freeway System Plan, was that widening any of these interstates in urban settings would be very difficult. Additionally, it was unclear as to whether the region would even want further widenings of the freeway system. One idea was to “cap the footprint” of the existing freeway rights-of-way. The consultant looked at choke points in the system, highlighting the actual rights-of-way and what could be done within those restrictions, which could be used to inform future planning efforts.

Mr. Hazlett explained that another project concept from the charrettes was an extension of the I-10 Reliever, also known as the SR-30 Corridor. This corridor is outside of the Proposition 400 funding, but is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In the RTP, however, the SR-30 ends at the South Mountain Freeway, and many participants in the study noted that it should instead continue all the way to downtown Phoenix. If it ended at the South Mountain Freeway, there would still be a constant bottleneck between the I-10/South Mountain interchange and the I-10/I-17 “Stack” interchange. With the cooperation of the City of Phoenix, the consultants began to examine what might be possible in the corridor between the South Mountain Freeway and the I-17, while still accommodating the Avenida Rio Salado. The high-level environmental review indicated that an extension of the corridor was feasible, and modeling showed the extension would carry 170,000 vehicles a day in 2035.

Mr. Hazlett noted that the consultant also examined best practices of Park-and-Rides lots (particularly in San Diego, Denver, and Seattle), and how they could integrate with the freeway system and use Direct HOV ramps (DHOVs). The consultant also examined the current DHOVs in Proposition 400 (such as the recent project to add DHOVs at Maryland Avenue and SR-101 in Glendale), and the potential to build additional DHOV ramps, at arterials, at system interchanges. The charrettes identified 35 DHOV possible locations. Because it would not be feasible to build all of those, the consultant narrowed the options down to eleven best candidate locations based on constructability, the existing system, and land use compatibility. MAG will need to work with member agencies to prioritize those eleven potential locations. The consultant created concept drawings for some of the potential DHOV locations, such as at I-17 and the Metrocenter mall.

Mr. Hazlett explained that the next phase of the Central Phoenix study will cover ATM deployment, roadway maintenance and diverging diamond interchanges (DDIs). The DDIs can improve bottlenecks at diamond interchanges for at a low cost. Regarding roadway maintenance, Mr. Hazlett noted that the region is currently in good shape for operations and maintenance (O&M), but in the 2040 horizon, there will be a large need for replacement or rehabilitation of 50-year old freeway structures. Additionally, the consultant will examine the potential for arterial indirect left turns, looking at the potential need to talk about grade separation of arterial intersections, transit strategies, and bicycle and pedestrian strategies.

Mr. Cook noted that the region needs to incorporate Operations and Maintenance very clearly moving ahead whenever decisions are made. Mr. Dovalina commended Mr. Hazlett and the

overall study team, stating that there are a lot of ideas coming out of this study, looking at a holistic network approach, and that the region cannot build its way out of congestion. This study is taking a good direction to help central cities find better ways to approach transportation. Mr. Martin asked if there was a path forward on the proposed HOT lanes on the Broadway Curve on I-10. Mr. Hazlett noted that ADOT has looked at improvements at the Broadway Curve for some time, and said that the Corridor Master Plan for the “spine” corridor will ask if there are other corridors that can be improved to help improve travel through that area. In scenarios with a managed lanes approach, an 18 lane section handled traffic better than a 24 lane section.

Additionally, when looking at operations and maintenance, wider lanes mean much higher operations and maintenance costs. Right now, operations and maintenance of the current freeway system, in an ideal situation, will \$17,400 per lane mile per year, or over \$2 billion over a 25 year period. Mr. Martin noted that he was not advocating to build out to more freeway lanes, but that he wanted to ensure that there was a way to address safety issues on the corridor, such as weaving. As far as costs to operations and maintenance, Mr. Martin was concerned about the sheer volume of studies being considered now for parkway studies by the county and additionally I-11, noting that these are very long and widely dispersed new corridors that will have their own operations and maintenance costs. Mr. Martin stated that he would potentially like to see the region put on a freeway diet, and not to see new freeway corridors expanded out far from the core, in part because of the operations and maintenance costs. Mr. Martin noted that he understood that the region may need these corridors in 2050, but that it seems the region is studying them as though they will be built in the next 20 years. Mr. Martin noted that the project focus has shifted from traffic counts to economic development.

Acting Chairwoman Albert noted that this item was only on the agenda for information and discussion, and that there was no action needed as part of this agenda item.

11. Information on the Grand Canyon State Logo Sign Program

Acting Chairwoman Albert invited Win Holden to present on the Grand Canyon State Logo Sign Program.

Mr. Holden provided the committee with an overview of the program, which is now under ADOT management after previously being managed by a private vendor from Minnesota. ADOT decided to bring the program back under their control in order to provide another source of revenue for the highway fund. Program in urban areas has potential to produce 4 to 5 times the revenue that rural areas were generating, or about \$10 million at maturity, all of which would go into the highway fund. There are six business types that are eligible for the program: food, gas, lodging, 24-hour pharmacies, attractions, and camping.

Mr. Holden emphasized that safety is always a key criterion, and ADOT has worked closely with FHWA partners. At each eligible interchange approach, there could be between 1 and 4 signs, with more signs being the exception rather than the rule, due to spacing and engineering concerns. The signs may be on the exited road or a cross street. A logo sign can be off of the freeway system if the business is on a qualified cross street, though pathfinder signs would be required in those instances. The signs are paid for, owned, and maintained by ADOT, but the locality needs to approve and permit the signs. The rules process for the signs was approved with a public hearing process.

Few signs have been installed yet, but a rollout plan is being followed for implementation. Market dynamics, business populations, and traffic counts at each intersection will determine the rates for the signage. If there is more competition, rates would be higher, and if there is less competition, rates would be lower.

Mr. Holden displayed a map of the tentative planned build-out, which is anticipated to take 3-4 years for the entire infrastructure in the Phoenix metro area. By the end of 2013, parts of SR-101 and I-17 will be ready. Most of the remainder of SR-101, as well as an additional section of I-17 and parts of I-10 will be ready in the first half of 2014. Most of SR-202, as well as the entire SR-51, will be ready by the end of 2014, and most of US-60 will be ready in 2015. Other metro areas in the state will be addressed once the Phoenix area is completed.

Mr. Cook noted that previously, ADOT was not very responsive to using signage beyond the MUTCD-required freeway signage. Mr. Cook noted that public facilities did not seem to be addressed by this program, for example, a city hall, centers for the arts, or historic districts. Mr. Holden replied that public facilities would not be addressed as part of this program, as they are not MUTCD-approved signs. Mr. Cook noted that the MUTCD is not an absolute requirement, and is only a guide, and that ADOT could add such facilities to the list through their process if they chose to do so. Mr. Holden replied that he would take that input back to ADOT, but such signs would not be part of this program, which is directed exclusively to commercial signage. Mr. Terry Lowe from Surprise asked if the program could be coordinated with mobile guidance systems such as Garmin. Mr. Holden replied that the private competitive companies do not want to be a part of the program yet. Additionally, ADOT does not want drivers to be using mobile devices while they are driving. However, the hope is that in the future, there could be a way to coordinate with them, but not at this time. Mr. Stillings asked about the 3 mile distance that businesses could be located away from the freeway and still have a sign as part of this program, as that might work in rural areas, but it would probably not be expected that drivers in urban area will go 3 miles off the interstate. Mr. Holden answered that it would be very unusual for a business to participate in the program if they were so far away in an urban area, with more competitors closer to the freeway; however, both the program and MUTCD permit it, and it is too soon in the program to tell whether those businesses would want to participate.

12. Request for Future Agenda Items

Acting Chairwoman Albert requested topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Review Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting. Mr. Martin asked the county to come in and update the committee on parkway studies, how those parkways connect to Interstate 11, and how these parkways would be paid for and maintained. Hearing no other requests, Acting Chairwoman Albert moved on to the next agenda item.

13. Member Agency Update

Acting Chairwoman Albert offered opportunities for member agencies to present updates to their community. There were no other updates from member agencies.

14. Next Meeting Date

The next regular Transportation Review Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday,

September 26, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room. Mr. Grant Anderson from Youngtown noted that there was a conflict with a special bicycle/pedestrian meeting scheduled on that day.

There being no further business, Acting Chairwoman Albert adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.